

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/731,008	12/07/2000	Mary Kay McCoy	G03.020	G03.020 8773		
28062	7590 07/14/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
BUCKLEY,	MASCHOFF, TALWAI	RUDY, ANDREW J				
5 ELM STRE NEW CANA	EET AN, CT 06840	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
			3627			
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applicatio	n No.	Applicant(s)  MCCOY, MARY KAY					
		09/731,00	8						
		Examiner	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Art Unit					
		Andrew Jo	seph Rudy	3627					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	5 April 2006							
2a)□	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
٠,ڪ	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	ion of Claims	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
· _	4) Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the application.								
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>7-18</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
· · _	Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.								
•	Claim(s) <u>1-0</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
-	Claim(s) is/are objected to:  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
		a, 01 0.00 a 011 10	quii oo						
	on Papers								
·	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>									
2)	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ r No(s)/Mail Date	<b>(</b> 08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	ТО-152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/731,008 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 25, 2006 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 7-18 remain withdrawn from consideration as drawn to a non-elected invention.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, line 2, the term "respective" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

Claim 1, line 5, the term "respective" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

Claim 1, line 9, the term "respective" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

Claim 1, line 10, the term "respective" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to. Claim 1, line 11, the term "respective" (second instance) is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

Claim 1, line 15, the term "respective" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

Claim 1, line 18, the phrase "substantially identical" is not clear as to what it means and/or relates to.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-6, as understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acosta et al., US 6,643,625.

Acosta discloses, e.g. Figs. 1-6, a computer implemented audit reports of loan credit portfolios. It is noted that each loan portfolio is inherently associated with a net operating income (NOI) value. Acosta does not disclose audit firms operating independently of each other.

Applicant's attempt at traversing the Official Notice findings as stated in the October 19, 2005 Office Action is inadequate. Adequate traversal is a two step process. First, Applicant must state their traversal on the record. Second, and in

Application/Control Number: 09/731,008

accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b) which requires Applicant to specifically point out the supposed errors in the Office Action, Applicant must state why the Office Action statements are not to be considered common knowledge or well known in the art.

In this application, Applicant has clearly met step (1) as traversal of Official Notice has been taken. Second, Applicant has failed step (2) since they have failed to argue why the Official Notice statements are not to be considered common knowledge or well known in the art. The standard of lack of documentary evidence is not convincing. Applicant did not affirmatively state why such common knowledge is not known. Because Applicant's traversal is inadequate, the Official Notice, e.g. common knowledge, statements are taken to be admitted as prior art. See, MPEP § 2144.03. It is noted that the additional further notice taken from the April 4, 2005 Office Action is also deemed conceded by the Applicant.

To have provided computerized audit reports from audit firms operating independently of each other for Acosta would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of Official Notice.

Applicant's other April 25, 2006 REMARKS have been reviewed, but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection.

6. Further pertinent references of interest are noted on the attached PTO-892.

Page 5

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Joseph Rudy whose telephone number is 571-272-6789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Andrew Joseph Rudy **Primary Examiner**

Art Unit 3627